DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 990 JC 800 144

AUTHOR Nespoli, Lawrence A.: Nair, P. C.
TITLE Employer Follow-Up, 1978. Research Report Number 20.
INSTITUTION Howard Community Coll., Columbia, Md.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Associate Degrees: College Graduates: Community Colleges: *Education Work Relationship: *Employer Attitudes: *Employment Qualifications: Job Skills: Job Training: *Junior Colleges: Occupational Surveys: *Personnel Evaluation: Questionnaires: State Surveys: Vocational Education: *Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS Maryland

ABSTRACT

An employer follow-up study was conducted by Howard Community College (HCC) in May, 1979, to determine the job performance of the HCC 1978 occupational program graduates. Only the employers of occupational graduates in full-time jobs related to their program of study were involved. These employers were asked, on a specially prepared questionnaire, to state opinions on the educational requirements of the jobs held by HCC graduates, the adequacy of the job preparation of the graduates, and the quality of their vocational training. Of the 34 questionnaires mailed, 32 were returned. Major findings indicate that almost half (46.7%) of the jobs held by the graduates required an associate degree, and that the associate degree was preferred for another 23% of the jobs. Over 89% of the employers indicated that the college's preparation of graduates for the performance of job skills was adequate or more than adequate, while 100% gave the same ratings to the ability of the graduates to learn new techniques and effectively communicate with superiors. A majority of the employers (81%) rated the overall vocational training of the graduates as good or very good, and 100% indicated that they would hire another HCC graduate. Data tables are provided throughout the document comparing the survey results with statewide findings from the other Maryland Community Colleges. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181990

EMPLOYER FOLLOW-UP, 1978

BY

Lawrence A. Nespoli, Director
P.C. Nair, Research Assistant
Office of Research, Planning, and Funding

Howard Community College
Columbia, Maryland

November 1979

JC 800 144

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LAWRENCE NESPOLI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
List of Tables		v
Brief Summary of Findings		vii
Chapter		
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Methodology	1
III.	Findings	1
	Educational Requirements for Employment	1
	Employer Assessment of Educational Preparation	2
	Employer Assessment of Vocational Training	4
	Would Supervisor Employ Another Graduate?	6
IV.	Summary	7
Appendices		
A	Comments by Employers	8
B	Maryland Community Colleges Employer Questionnaire	10
C	Employer Follow-Up Data by Occupational Programs	12
D	Names and Addresses of Participating Employers	19

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Educational Level Required for Employment	13
II-A	Adequacy of Job Preparation--Performance of Job Skills From Beginning of Employment	13
II-B	Adequacy of Job Preparation--Familiarity With Tests or Lab Equipment From Beginning of Employment	14
II-C	Adequacy of Job Preparation--Ability to Learn New Techniques on Job	14
II-D	Adequacy of Job Preparation--Ability to Communicate With Supervisors	15
II-E	Adequacy of Job Preparation--Ability to Work Well With Other Workers	15
III-A	Adequacy of Vocational Training--Technical knowledge	16
III-B	Adequacy of Vocational Training--Work Attitude	16
III-C	Adequacy of Vocational Training--Work Quality	17
III-D	Adequacy of Vocational Training--Overall Rating	17
IV	Preparation Compared to Employees Not Receiving Vocational Training	18
V	Would Supervisor Employ Another Graduate?	18

BRIEF SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
RESEARCH REPORT NUMBER 20

TITLE: Employer Follow-Up, 1978

AUTHOR: Lawrence A. Nespoli, Director of Research, Planning, and Funding and P.C. Nair, Research Assistant

PURPOSE: To provide an evaluation of the job preparation of 1978 occupational program graduates of Howard Community College, and of the vocational training received by those graduates.

METHODOLOGY: A survey instrument was developed jointly by members of the Maryland Community College Research Group and distributed statewide. Only employers of occupational graduates in full-time jobs related to their program of study were surveyed. 32 of 34 employers of HCC occupational graduates returned completed questionnaires. Summary data are reported for HCC and statewide community college graduates. Individual program analyses are provided in Appendix C.

FINDINGS: Almost one half of the jobs held by HCC occupational program graduates require an associate degree. For another 23 percent of the jobs, an associate degree is preferred.

Over eighty-nine percent of the employers of HCC occupational program graduates believe that the College's preparation of graduates for the performance of job skills (from the beginning of employment) is adequate or more than adequate.

One hundred percent of the employers believe that the ability of HCC occupational graduates to learn new techniques on the job and their ability to communicate with superiors is adequate or more than adequate.

Over eighty-one percent of the employers rate the overall vocational training of HCC occupational graduates as good or very good.

One hundred percent of the employers say they would employ another Howard Community College graduate.

I. INTRODUCTION

This research report presents detailed information on the job performance of 1978 occupational program graduates of Howard Community College. It is the second phase of the annual follow-up research done at the College to determine the education and/or employment activities of its graduates (See Follow-Up of 1978 Graduates, Volume I, Research Report Number 19).

The project has been designed to survey the opinions of employers on the educational requirements of jobs held by HCC graduates, the adequacy of the job preparation of the HCC graduates they employ, and the quality of the vocational training received by those graduates. Employers were also asked to compare the preparation of HCC graduates with that of other employees who did not receive similar educational training.

As was the case with the 1978 graduate follow-up study, the questionnaire developed for use in the current study was a joint effort by members of the Maryland Community College Research Group. Thus, for the first time, comparable statewide employer follow-up data are available.

HCC and statewide data by individual occupational program have been tabulated and are provided in Appendix C. These data will be of interest to those concerned with employer follow-up data on particular occupational curricula. However, due to the small size of the study population, this report will discuss only summary data -- both for Howard Community College and for community colleges statewide.

II. METHODOLOGY

The intent of the study was to survey only the employers of graduates of occupational programs and -- within that group -- only the employers of those in full-time jobs "directly related" or at least "somewhat related" to their program of study.[1] Eighty two respondents to the 1978 graduate follow-up reported immediate employment after graduation, sixty three in full-time jobs. Forty five of these gave permission for the college to contact their employer for the purpose of evaluating the particular curricular program from which they graduated. Thirty four of the students giving permission for the employer contact met the final criteria of graduating from an occupational program and working in a job directly or somewhat related to that program.

Survey forms were first mailed to the employers of these thirty four graduates on May 15, 1979 with a follow-up mailing on May 30, 1979. As a result of these two mailings, thirty two completed survey forms were received for a response rate of ninety four percent.

III. FINDINGS

Educational Requirements for Employment

Employers were first asked to assess the level of education required for employment in the position held by the community college graduate. Table I summarizes the employer responses.

[1] This information was available through responses to the graduate follow-up survey (See Table XVI, Follow-Up of 1978 Graduates, Volume I).

Table I
Educational Level Required for Employment

For the job held by the community college graduate, is a two-year associate degree required?

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
Yes, at least an Associate degree is required	14	46.7	42.2%
No, but preference is given to holders of an Associate degree	7	23.3	23.3%
No, and no preference is given	9	30.0	34.5%
TOTAL	30	100.0	100.0%

Fourteen of the 30 employers of HCC career graduates (or 46.7 percent of those responding) stated that for the HCC graduate they supervise, at least an AA degree is required. Another 7 employers of HCC career graduates (23.3 percent) indicated an associate degree is not required but that preference is given to a person who possesses an AA degree. Nine of the 30 employers (30 percent) stated that an AA degree is not required and no preference is given to a holder of an associate degree.

Statewide figures are similar although employers of HCC career graduates tend to require an AA degree more than their statewide counterparts (46.7 percent to 42.2 percent).

Employer Assessment of Educational Preparation

Tables II-A through II-E present employer ratings of the educational preparation of community college graduates in various areas including performance of job skills, familiarity with tests and/or laboratory equipment required by the job, the ability to learn new techniques on the job, the ability to communicate with superiors, and the ability to work well with other workers.

Table II-A summarizes employer assessments of the educational preparation of community college graduates for the general performance of job skills from the beginning of employment. Slightly over eighty nine percent of the employers of HCC graduates who responded to the survey stated that they felt that HCC's preparation for employment in this area was at least adequate (adequate or more than adequate). Statewide the corresponding figure was 89.3, the same as HCC's.

Table II-A
Adequacy of Job Preparation

Performance of job skills from beginning of employment:

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
More than adequate	12	42.9	34.8%
Adequate	13	46.4	54.5%
Inadequate	3	10.7	10.7%
TOTAL	28	100.0	100.0%

Over eighty five percent of HCC career graduate supervisors stated that they felt that HCC's preparation for employment -- as reflected in the career graduate's familiarity with test or laboratory equipment required by their job from the beginning of employment (see Table IIB) -- was at least adequate (adequate or more than adequate). Three of the employers of HCC career graduates who responded to the survey (14.3%) remarked that test/equipment familiarity was inadequate. Statewide results indicate that 16.3% of supervisors of community college graduates remarked that test/equipment familiarity was inadequate, slightly higher than what was reported by HCC career graduate supervisors.

Table II-B
Adequacy of Job Preparation

Familiarity with test or laboratory equipment required from the beginning of employment:

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
More than adequate	6	28.6	21.9%
Adequate	12	57.1	61.8%
Inadequate	3	14.3	16.3%
TOTAL	21	100.0	100.0%

None of the employers who responded to the HCC survey rated the College's preparation in the area of their employee's ability to learn new techniques on the job as inadequate (see Table II-C). Statewide this figure was 1.8 percent.

Table II-C
Adequacy of Job Preparation

Ability to learn new techniques on the job:

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
More than adequate	17	56.4	53.8%
Adequate	13	43.3	44.4%
Inadequate	0	0.0	1.8%
TOTAL	30	100.0	100.0%

Table II-D reports employer assessments of the ability of community college graduates to communicate with their superiors. One hundred percent of HCC's career graduate employers stated that their assessment of HCC's preparation in this area was at least adequate (adequate or more than adequate). Statewide, the corresponding figure was 96.9 percent.

Table II-D
Adequacy of Job Preparation

Ability to communicate with superiors:

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
More than adequate	13	44.8	46.0%
Adequate	16	55.2	50.9%
Inadequate	0	0.0	3.1%
TOTAL	29	100.0	100.0%

Finally, based on their experiences of supervising HCC career graduates, 96.5 percent of the responding employers stated that HCC preparation in the area of the graduates' abilty to work well with other workers was at least adequate (see Table II-E). Further, more than half of these employers at the local level (58.6%) rated this area as more than adequate.

Table II-E
Adequacy of Job Preparation

Ability to work well with other workers:

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
More than adequate	17	58.6	57.3%
Adequate	11	37.9	40.6%
Inadequate	1	3.4	2.1%
TOTAL	29	99.9	100.0%

In sum, five areas of college preparation for employment were examined. In all five areas, 85 percent or more of the employers of HCC graduates rated college preparation for employment as adequate or more than adequate. In two of the areas (ability to learn new techniques on the job and ability to communicate with superiors), 100 percent of the employers described the preparation of HCC graduates as adequate or more than adequate. In four of the five areas, the percentage of employers of HCC graduates rating employee job preparation as at least adequate (adequate or more than adequate) was higher than the figure for employers of community college graduates statewide.

Employer Assessment of Vocational Training

Employers were also asked to rate the vocational training received by community college graduates. They were asked to provide ratings for specific areas -- technical knowledge, work attitude, and work quality -- and also an overall rating of the vocational training received. Tables III-A through III-D present these data.

Employers of 1978 HCC career graduates generally gave high marks to the vocational training of their employee in the area of technical knowledge (see Table III-A). Twelve of the 29 employers responding (41.4 percent) rated this area as good, and ten (34.5 percent) rated it as very good. Statewide the corresponding figures were 47.8 and 31.4 percent.

Table III-A
Adequacy of Vocational Training

Technical knowledge:

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
Very good	10	34.5	31.4%
Good	12	41.4	47.8%
Neutral	6	20.7	17.0%
Poor	1	3.4	3.8%
Very poor	0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	29	100.0	100.0%

Table III-B shows employer assessments of work attitude. Over eighty nine percent of the employers rated the vocational training received by their HCC career program graduate in this area as good or very good. This figure is consistent with the statewide pattern of responses on work attitude.

Table III-B
Adequacy of Vocational Training

Work attitude:

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
Very good	16	55.2	54.3%
Good	10	34.5	35.5%
Neutral	3	10.3	8.4%
Poor	0	0.0	1.8%
Very poor	0	0.0	0.0%
TOTAL	29	100.0	100.0%

Work quality (Table III-C) was given a positive evaluation by both employers of HCC career program graduates and employers of state community college career program graduates, with over 93 percent of HCC employers and over 88 percent of the statewide employers indicating a rating of at least good (good or very good).

Table III-C
Adequacy of Vocational Training

Work quality:

Responses	HCC #	HCC %	Statewide
Very good	15	51.7	44.1%
Good	12	41.4	44.1%
Neutral	2	6.9	11.2%
Poor	0	0.0	.6%
Very Poor	0	0.0	0.0%
TOTAL	29	100.0	100.0%

Table III-D presents the overall ratings employers gave the vocational training received by community college graduates. Over forty percent of the employers of HCC career program graduates rated the HCC vocational training received by their employee as very good. Another 37 percent rated it as good. In short, employers seem very pleased with the vocational training of HCC career program graduates. Corresponding statewide figures are 35.7 percent (very good) and 47.2 percent (good).

Table III-D
Adequacy of Vocational Training

Overall rating of vocational training received by employee as it relates to requirements of job:

Responses	HCC		Statewide
	#	%	
Very good	12	44.5	35.7%
Good	10	37.0	47.2%
Neutral	5	18.5	12.6%
Poor	0	0.0	4.5%
Very Poor	0	0.0	0.0%
TOTAL	27	100.0	100.0%

Finally, over forty seven percent of the employers of HCC graduates indicated that these graduates are better prepared for employment than other employees who did not receive similar vocational training (see Table IV). Another 32 percent rated the preparation of HCC career program graduates as about the same as employees not receiving vocational training.

Table IV
Preparation Compared to Employees Not Receiving Vocational Training

Preparation in relation to other employees in work group who did not receive such training:

Responses	HCC		Statewide
	#	%	
Individual is better prepared	9	47.4	51.8%
Both are about the same	6	31.6	31.0%
Individual is less prepared	4	21.0	17.2%
TOTAL	19	100.0	100.0%

Would Supervisor Employ Another Graduate?

Employers were also asked if they would employ another community college graduate. Both HCC and statewide results to this item indicate that almost all employers would

employ another community college graduate who has a degree or certificate in the same area as their current employee. One hundred percent of the employers of HCC graduates responded in the affirmative (see Table V).

Table V
Would Supervisor Employ Another Graduate?

Would supervisor employ another graduate from the community college who has a degree or certificate in the same area as current employee?

Responses	HCC		Statewide
	#	%	
Yes	29	100.0	97.2%
No	0	0.0	2.8%
TOTAL	29	100.0	100.0%

Employers were given the opportunity to specify any additional skills or areas of knowledge that, in their opinion, career program graduates of community colleges should have. These comments are presented in Appendix A.

IV. SUMMARY

Employers of 1978 HCC career program graduates gave the college and the occupational programs of the college very positive evaluations. Among the findings of the study to support this conclusion are the following:

---over eighty nine percent of the employers felt that HCC's preparation for employment in the area of performance of job skills from the beginning of employment was at least adequate (adequate or more than adequate).
---one hundred percent of the employers rated the ability of HCC graduates to learn new techniques on the job and their ability to communicate with superiors as adequate or more than adequate.
---over eighty one percent of the employers responded good or very good when asked to rate the overall vocational training received by HCC graduates as it relates to the requirements of the jobs taken by those graduates.
---one hundred percent of the employers stated that they would employ another graduate from Howard Community College who had a degree or certificate in the same area as the current graduate working for them.

This report presents an overall evaluation of career programs offered at Howard Community College as viewed by employers of its 1978 career program graduates. Overall the assessment is good. Of course, evaluations of individual curricular programs may vary considerably. For this reason, the program-specific data contained in Appendix C are of considerable importance. These data provide one basis for an ongoing evaluation of career programs. As such, they are a part of the overall program evaluation process at Howard Community College.

Appendix A

COMMENTS

1. Miscellaneous comments by employers of 1978 graduates on additional skills or areas of knowledge that an Associate in Arts or Certificate graduate should have.

Data Processing

"In your programming course, I feel more emphasis should be given to the areas of logic, flowcharting, debuging and testing."

"Our groups are users of scientific languages (Fortran and PLI)."

Nursing

"I do not think any A.A. graduate has acquired sufficient skills to function in an internship program."

"More clinical experience to enable nurses to carry out procedures and increase their confidence before placement in the job market."

"Increase experience clinically in intensive care areas."

"More managerial skills in ward management and supervising subordinates would be helpful."

"Team-leading experience; clinical skills as much as possible."

"Group assignments (more than 1 or 2 patients)."

"Team-leading skills a must."

Carpentry

"Administration, basic statistical analysis, accounting, computer science."

"Problem solving."

Biomedical Engineering

"Expanded knowledge of general hand tools should be considered."

"More training with basic hand tools and either a DVM or VOM."

Vision Care

"Better math skills and more sophisticated communication skills such as writing, speech, etc."

2. Miscellaneous comments by employers of 1978 graduates.

Accounting

"My comments are based on the named individual. Other graduates have proven superior and will in time be more successful. HCC cannot be responsible for individuals shortcomings."

Secretarial Science

"Send us more like her."

Data Processing

"The guy's good!!!"

"In the programming job, the heart of the program is the logic and the means of building new and better techniques."

Nursing

"All of the graduates from Howard have done very well in my unit, and I would hire others. I feel their maturity is a big factor in their work."

"This staff nurse was a Licensed Practical Nurse of SHC and therefore acquired a great deal of clinical experience prior to receiving the AA degree."

"This person is a good nurse and dependable employee."

"She is a good nurse and well liked by patients and staff."

"Attitude is great! She is a pleasure to work with and has improved greatly in 4 months."

Carpentry

"Knowledge gained in the course is a coincidental asset to the performance of unrelated duties."

"This degree is a fine start, but in the exhibits field the work is so varied it takes years of experience before the worker is highly qualified."

Biomedical Engineering

"He has proven himself to be an outstanding employee and his future potential for advancement appears great."

APPENDIX B

MARYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGES
EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help your community college and the State Board for Community Colleges assess and improve their programs. Please return it in the envelope provided. Thank you for your assistance.

Name of Graduate

Graduate's Job Title

A. For the job held by the community college graduate you supervise, is a two-year associate degree required? (check one)

14
- ☐ 1. Yes, at least an associate degree is required
- ☐ 2. No, but preference is given to holders of an associate degree
- ☐ 3. No, and no preference is given

B. Based on your own experience of supervising a community college graduate, please indicate how adequately you feel the college prepared him/her in each of the areas listed below. (check appropriate response)

	More Than Adequate 1	Adequate 2	Inadequate 3	Not Observed or Not Applicable 4
15 Performance of job skills from beginning of employment	☐	☐	☐	☐
16 Familiarity with any test or laboratory equipment required by this job from the beginning of employment	☐	☐	☐	☐
17 Ability to learn new techniques on the job	☐	☐	☐	☐
18 Ability to communicate with superiors	☐	☐	☐	☐
19 Ability to work well with other workers	☐	☐	☐	☐

(over)

ITEMS BELOW FOR COLLEGE USE ONLY

15

College Code (1 2 3 4) Program Number (5 6 7 8 9 10) (11) C A (12) B I A H W F (13) M F

C. Please rate the vocational training received by the individual in the following areas: (check appropriate response)

		Very Good 5	Good 4	Neutral 3	Poor 2	Very Poor 1
20	Technical knowledge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21	Work attitude	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22	Work quality	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23	What is your overall rating of the vocational training received by this individual as it relates to the requirements of his/her job?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

D. As a result of this person's vocational training, how would you rate his/her preparation in relation to other employees in his/her work group who did not receive such training? (check one)

24
- ☐ 0. No basis for comparison
- ☐ 1. Individual is better prepared
- ☐ 2. Both are about the same
- ☐ 3. Individual is less prepared

E. In general, would you employ another graduate from this community college who has a degree or certificate in the same area as your current employee?

25
- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No Why? _____

F. Please specify any additional skills or areas of knowledge that you feel an Associate in Arts or Certificate graduate you employ should have.

_____

_____

_____

G. Please feel free to add any additional comments.

_____

_____

_____

H. If further evaluation of college programs is needed, would you be willing to share your expertise and be contacted by our faculty?

26 ☐ Yes ☐ No

Supervisor completing this questionnaire:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Company/Organization: _____

City/State/Zip Code: _____

APPENDIX C
Employer Follow-up Data By Occupational Programs

The tables in this appendix present employer follow-up data for Howard Community College by individual occupational programs. The numbers of the tables are keyed to those used throughout the text of the report.

Employer responses are distributed according to the 8 program categories for which survey responses were received at HCC. The statewide "TOTAL" figures reflect statewide data for these program categories only. The "ALL STATE PROGRAMS" figures show statewide totals for all community college occupational programs in Maryland, whether or not they are offered at HCC. The text of the report uses the "TOTAL" figures for comparative purposes.

TABLE I
Educational Level Required for Employment

PROGRAM	ASSOCIATE DEGREE REQUIRED		ASSOCIATE DEGREE PREFERRED		ASSOCIATE DEGREE NOT REQUIRED OR PREFERRED	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC						
Accounting	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Retailing	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Sec. Sci.	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0
Data Proc.	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7
Nursing	7	63.6	0	.0	4	36.4
Carpentry	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0
BMET	0	.0	2	100.0	0	.0
Vision Care	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=30)	14	46.7	7	23.3	9	30.0
STATEWIDE						
Accounting	6	37.5	9	56.3	1	6.3
Retailing	2	28.6	2	28.6	3	42.9
Sec. Sci.	9	12.3	37	50.7	27	37.0
Data Proc.	17	45.9	13	35.1	7	18.9
Nursing	86	57.3	4	2.7	60	40.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0
BMET	0	.0	2	100.0	0	.0
TOTAL	121	42.2	67	23.3	99	34.5
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	226	31.6	268	37.4	222	31.0

TABLE IIA
Adequacy of Job Preparation
(Performance of job skills from beginning of employment)

PROGRAM	MORE THAN ADEQUATE		ADEQUATE		INADEQUATE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC						
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	.0
Nursing	2	18.2	6	54.5	3	27.3
Carpentry	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
Vision Care	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=28)	12	42.9	13	46.4	3	10.7
STATEWIDE						
Accounting	4	28.6	10	71.4	0	.0
Retailing	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	46	65.7	23	32.9	1	1.4
Data Proc.	11	30.6	23	63.9	2	5.6
Nursing	32	21.2	92	60.9	27	17.9
Carpentry	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
TOTAL	97	34.8	152	54.5	30	10.7
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	280	39.8	378	53.8	45	6.4

TABLE IIB
Adequacy of Job Preparation
(Familiarity with tests or lab equipment from beginning of employment)

PROGRAM	MORE THAN ADEQUATE		ADEQUATE		INADEQUATE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC						
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	.0
Nursing	0	.0	8	72.7	3	27.3
Carpentry	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
Vision Care	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=21)	6	28.6	12	57.1	3	14.3
STATEWIDE						
Accounting	3	42.9	4	57.1	0	.0
Retailing	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	19	50.0	19	50.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	6	21.4	20	71.4	2	7.1
Nursing	20	13.3	95	63.3	35	23.3
Carpentry	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
TOTAL	50	21.9	141	61.8	37	16.3
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	150	27.3	348	63.3	52	9.5

TABLE IIC
Adequacy of Job Preparation
(Ability to learn new techniques on job)

PROGRAM	MORE THAN ADEQUATE		ADEQUATE		INADEQUATE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC						
Accounting	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	.0
Nursing	4	36.4	7	63.6	0	.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Vision Care	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=30)	17	56.7	13	43.3	0	.0
STATEWIDE						
Accounting	7	43.8	9	56.3	0	.0
Retailing	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	53	75.7	17	24.3	0	.0
Data Proc.	18	50.0	17	47.2	1	2.8
Nursing	70	44.9	82	52.6	4	2.6
Carpentry	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL	155	53.8	128	44.4	5	1.8
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	417	57.0	301	41.2	13	1.8

TABLE IID
Adequacy of Job Preparation
(Ability to communicate with superiors)

PROGRAM	MORE THAN ADEQUATE		ADEQUATE		INADEQUATE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC						
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	2	33.3	4	66.7	0	.0
Nursing	4	36.4	7	63.6	0	.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Vision Care	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=29)	13	44.8	16	55.2	0	.0
STATEWIDE						
Accounting	5	33.3	9	60.0	1	6.7
Retailing	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	42	60.0	27	38.6	1	1.4
Data Proc.	13	36.1	19	52.8	4	11.1
Nursing	66	42.3	87	55.8	3	1.9
Carpentry	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL	132	46.0	146	50.9	9	3.1
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	363	50.1	334	46.1	28	3.9

TABLE IIE
(Ability to work well with other workers)

PROGRAM	MORE THAN ADEQUATE		ADEQUATE		INADEQUATE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC						
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	4	80.0	1	20.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	.0
Nursing	4	36.4	6	54.5	1	9.1
Carpentry	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Vision Care	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=29)	17	58.6	11	37.9	1	3.4
STATEWIDE						
Accounting	6	40.0	8	53.3	1	6.7
Retailing	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	51	72.9	19	27.1	0	.0
Data Proc.	21	58.3	15	41.7	0	.0
Nursing	79	51.0	71	45.8	5	3.2
Carpentry	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL	164	57.3	116	40.6	6	2.1
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	434	59.9	272	37.6	18	2.5

TABLE IIIA
Adequacy of Vocational Training
(Technical knowledge)

PROGRAM	VERY GOOD		GOOD		NEUTRAL		POOR		VERY POOR	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC										
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3	0	.0	0	.0
Nursing	2	18.2	6	54.5	3	27.3	0	.0	0	.0
Carpentry	0	.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Vision Care	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=29)	10	34.5	12	41.4	6	20.7	1	3.4	0	.0
STATEWIDE										
Accounting	5	31.3	9	56.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	0	.0
Retailing	4	57.1	1	14.3	2	28.6	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	35	49.3	32	45.1	4	5.6	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	15	41.7	16	44.4	5	13.9	0	.0	0	.0
Nursing	30	19.6	77	50.3	36	23.5	10	6.5	0	.0
Carpentry	0	.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL	90	31.4	137	47.8	49	17.0	11	3.8	0	.0
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	272	37.3	338	46.4	102	14.0	17	2.3	0	.0

TABLE IIIB
Adequacy of Vocational Training
(Work Attitude)

PROGRAM	VERY GOOD		GOOD		NEUTRAL		POOR		VERY POOR	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC										
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3	0	.0	0	.0
Nursing	6	54.5	5	45.5	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Vision Care	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=29)	16	55.2	10	34.5	3	10.3	0	.0	0	.0
STATEWIDE										
Accounting	6	37.5	7	43.8	3	18.8	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	5	71.4	0	.0	2	28.6	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	51	72.9	16	22.9	3	4.3	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	21	58.3	11	30.6	4	11.1	0	.0	0	.0
Nursing	70	45.5	67	43.5	12	7.8	5	3.2	0	.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL	156	54.3	102	35.5	24	8.4	5	1.8	0	.0
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	404	55.3	244	33.4	69	9.4	13	1.8	1	.1

TABLE IIIC
Adequacy of Vocational Training
(Work Quality)

PROGRAM	VERY GOOD		GOOD		NEUTRAL		POOR		VERY POOR	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC										
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Nursing	6	54.5	5	45.5	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Carpentry	0	.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Vision Care	2	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=29)	15	51.7	12	41.4	2	6.9	0	.0	0	.0
STATEWIDE										
Accounting	6	37.5	7	43.8	3	18.8	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	5	71.4	0	.0	2	28.6	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	34	48.6	33	47.1	3	4.3	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	20	55.6	13	36.1	3	8.3	0	.0	0	.0
Nursing	60	39.2	71	46.4	20	13.1	2	1.3	0	.0
Carpentry	0	.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL	126	44.1	126	44.1	32	11.2	2	.6	0	.0
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	352	48.3	296	40.6	72	9.9	9	1.2	0	.0

TABLE IIID
Adequacy of Vocational Training
(Overall rating)

PROGRAM	VERY GOOD		GOOD		NEUTRAL		POOR		VERY POOR	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC										
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	3	50.0	0	.0	3	50.0	0	.0	0	.0
Nursing	3	30.0	6	60.0	1	10.0	0	.0	0	.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Vision Care	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=27)	12	44.5	10	37.0	5	18.5	0	.0	0	.0
STATEWIDE										
Accounting	6	37.5	9	56.3	1	6.3	0	.0	0	.0
Retailing	4	57.1	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	41	57.7	28	39.4	2	2.8	0	.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	17	47.2	14	38.9	5	13.9	0	.0	0	.0
Nursing	32	21.1	82	53.9	26	17.1	12	7.9	0	.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0
BMET	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL	102	35.7	135	47.2	36	12.6	13	4.5	0	.0
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	281	38.7	344	47.3	83	11.4	19	2.6	0	.0

TABLE IV
Preparation Compared to Employees Not Receiving Vocational Training

PROGRAM	BETTER PREPARED		SAME		LESS PREPARED	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
HCC						
Accounting	0	.0	0	.0	1	100.0
Retailing	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	.0
Nursing	2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0
BMET	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
Vision Care	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=19)	9	47.4	6	31.6	4	21.0
STATEWIDE						
Accounting	6	75.0	1	12.5	1	12.5
Retailing	3	75.0	0	.0	1	25.0
Sec. Sci.	48	82.8	9	15.5	1	1.7
Data Proc.	13	68.4	5	26.3	1	5.3
Nursing	33	29.7	48	43.2	30	27.0
Carpentry	1	50.0	0	.0	1	50.0
BMET	1	100.0	0	.0	0	.0
TOTAL	105	51.8	63	31.0	35	17.2
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	369	69.6	115	21.7	46	8.7

TABLE V
Would Supervisor Employ Another Graduate?

PROGRAM	YES		NO	
	N	%	N	%
HCC				
Accounting	1	100.0	0	.0
Retailing	1	100.0	0	.0
Sec. Sci.	4	100.0	0	.0
Data Proc.	6	100.0	0	.0
Nursing	11	100.0	0	.0
Carpentry	2	100.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0
Vision Care	2	100.0	0	.0
TOTAL (N=29)	29	100.0	0	.0
STATEWIDE				
Accounting	16	94.1	1	5.9
Retailing	4	66.7	2	33.3
Sec. Sci.	69	97.2	2	2.8
Data Proc.	36	97.3	1	2.7
Nursing	150	98.7	2	1.3
Carpentry	2	100.0	0	.0
BMET	2	100.0	0	.0
TOTAL	279	97.2	8	2.8
ALL STATE PROGRAMS	706	97.4	19	2.6

APPENDIX D
Names and Addresses of Participating Employers

Career Programs	Employer Responding to Questionnaire
Accounting	Mr. Larry E. Cooper Chief Accountant Universities Space Research Assoc. Suite 311, American City Building Columbia, MD 21044
Biomedical Engineering	Mr. G. Fred Plitt District Service Supervisor Beckman Instruments, Inc. Silver Spring, MD 20904
Biomedical Engineering	Mr. William F. Curran Manager Biomedical Engineering Georgetown University Hospital Washington, D.C. 20007
Carpentry	Dr. Patricia Smith Director ASCIA Administration for Services to Chronically Ill and Aging Department of Health and Mental Hygiene 201 W. Preston Street Baltimore, MD 21201
Carpentry	Mr. David E. Christie Supervisory Exhibits Specialist Museum of Natural History Smithsonian Institute Washington, D.C. 20560
Carpentry	Mr. William G. Bracken Job Supervisor Elview Construction Company Colorado Springs, Colorado 80918
Data Processing	Mr. Donald P. O'Brien Applications Manager Londontown Corporation Eldersburg, MD 21784
Data Processing	Mr. L. D. Grogan Manager, Manufacturing Engineering Unitote/Regitel 100 West Road Towson, MD 21204
Data Processing	Mr. Homer K. Burton Manager Conversion Operations Display Data Corporation Hunt Valley, MD 21031

Career Programs	Employer Responding to Questionnaire
Data Processing	Ms. Donna Hejny Group Leader - Systems Programming American Bank Stationery 7501 Pulaski Highway Baltimore, MD 21237
Data Processing	Mr. Burton Meisel Manager of Programming Baltimore Federal Savings and Loan Fayette and St. Paul Streets Baltimore, MD 21202
Data Processing	Mr. Martin E. Basko Senior Field Engineer Bendix Field Engineering Corporation 9250 Route 108 Columbia, MD 21045
Nursing	Ms. Linda H. Blankman, R.N. Head Nurse, 4 East Holy Cross Hospital Silver Spring, MD 20910
Nursing	Ms. Helen Stauffer, R.N. Springfield Hospital Center Sykesville, MD 21784
Nursing	Ms. Katie Hanna Critical Care Area Unit Coordinator Montgomery General Hospital 18101 Prince Philip Drive Olney, MD 20832
Nursing	Mrs. Jo Ann Novasatka, R.N. Taylor Manor Hospital College Avenue Ellicott City, MD 21043
Nursing	Kim L. Kaufman, R.N. Clinical Nurse, Infant Special Care Johns Hopkins Hospital 601 N. Broadway Baltimore, MD 21218
Nursing	Ms. Fannie Anderson Nursing Director Chief Springfield Hospital Center Sykesville, MD 21784
Nursing	Ms. Alice Devlin, R.N. Unit Coordinator Montgomery General Hospital 18101 Prince Philip Drive Olney, MD 20832

Career Programs	Employer Responding to Questionnaire
Nursing	Ms. Teresa Salemi, R.N. Preceptor Nurse Internship (Surgery) Johns Hopkins Hospital Baltimore, MD 21205
Retailing	Mr. Stanley Weinberg Salon Manager Hairmasters Beauty Salon Columbia Mall Columbia, MD 21044
Retailing	Ms. Margaret Godwin Personnel Clerk Woodward & Lothrop Columbia Mall Columbia, MD 21044
Secretarial Science	Mr. Robert Pride Management Design Associates 314 American City Building Columbia, MD 21044
Secretarial Science	Mr. John F. Sturm, Esquire Senior Attorney National Broadcasting Company, Inc. 1800 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006
Secretarial Science	Luke Kao, M.D. 11085 Little Patuxent Parkway Columbia, MD 21044
Secretarial Science	Mr. Robert Capretto Gilford Instrument Laboratories, Inc. 9130 Red Branch Road Columbia, MD 21045
Secretarial Science	Drs. Arthur A. Theisen or Ellis G. Knox Executive Officers Soil and Land Use Technology, Inc. P.O. Box 1153 Columbia, MD 21044
Secretarial Science	Mr. Robert S. Downs Administrative Officer HUD National Training Center Clark Building, 2nd Floor 5565 Sterrett Place Columbia, MD 21044

Career Programs	Employer Responding to Questionnaire
Vision Care	Dr. Robert Schoen Vision Care Program Director Howard Community College Little Patuxent Parkway Columbia, MD 21044
Vision Care	Dr. Eugene R. Barenburg Barenburg Optometric Service 9200 Baltimore National Pike Ellicott City, MD 21043

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 56

MAR 21 1980